UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,446	03/31/2004	Jenda Jao	14233.69	5458

21999   7590   06/03/2008
KIRTON AND MCCONKIE
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE,
SUITE 1800
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER
MCLEOD, MARSHALL M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/814,446	JAO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MARSHALL MCLEOD	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 February 2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 9-16* is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 9-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This Office action has been issued in response to amendment filed 04 February 2008.

Claims 1, 2 and 12 have been amended. Claims 8 and 17-21 have been cancelled without

prejudice. Applicants' arguments have been carefully and respectfully considered in light of the

instant amendment, but are still not persuasive. Accordingly, this action has been made FINAL.

Priority

2.   Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-

(d) prior to declaration of an interference, a certified English translation of the foreign

application must be submitted in reply to this action. 37 CFR 41.154(b) and 41.202(e).

Failure to provide a certified translation may result in no benefit being accorded for the non-

English application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   **Claims 1-7 and 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg (Patent No US 7093193 B1) in view of "applicant admitted prior art", hereinafter (AAPA) and further in view of Lieberman (Patent No US 6516349 BI).**

5.   With respect to claim 1, Goldberg discloses a web-page processing method (Column 1, lines 64-66), comprising steps of: parsing web-page data of a web page to locate a first portion of contents associated with a server-side command (Column 1, lines 36-39; Column 2, lines 12-13; Column 3, lines 35-37); recording a first index data which indicates storage addresses of said first portion of contents in a database (Column 2, lines 12-13; Column3, lines 45-46); and outputting said first portion of contents to a server according to said first index data in said database in response to a read command of said server (Column 2, lines 13-18). Goldberg does not disclose an array or a linking list; referring to a filename of said web page and a file allocation table associated with an operating system of said server.

However, AAPA discloses referring to a filename of said web page and a file allocation table associated with an operating system of said server (Page 1; [0007], lines 9-14).
It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Goldberg with the teachings of AAPA in order to simplify and speed up searches for web pages in the file allocation table.

The combination of Goldberg and AAPA does not disclose an array or a linking list. However, Lieberman discloses an array or a linking list (Column 5, lines 8-10).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the combined teachings of Goldberg and AAPA with the teachings of

Lieberman in order to organize, store and speed up searches for data.

6.   With respect to claim 2, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In

addition Goldberg discloses recording a second index data which indicates storage addresses of

said second portion of contents in said database (Column 5, lines 36-50, i.e. may reside as files

of a file system stored in appropriate storage devices at the local computer); and outputting said

second portion of contents to said server according to said second index data in said database of

said server in response to said read command of said server (Column 5, lines 51-56, i.e. …string

template pages resides at the remote computer that conforms to HTML standards. It is to be

appreciated that.., the local computer may be capable of browsing documents). Goldberg does

not disclose an array or a linking list; referring to said filename of said web page and said file

allocation table associated with an operating system.

However, AAPA discloses referring to said filename of said web page and a file allocation table

associated with an operating system of said server (Page 1; [0007], lines 9-14). The combination

of Goldberg and AAPA does not disclose an array or a linking list. However, Lieberman

discloses an array or a linking list (Column 5, lines 8-10).

7.   With respect to claim 3, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2 above. In

addition Goldberg discloses wherein said first portion of contents is a first command block

including one or more continuous server-side commands (Column 1, lines 36-43), and said second portion of contents is a second command block including one or more continuous client-side commands (Column 2, lines 13-18).

8.   With respect to claim 4, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3 above. In addition Goldberg discloses wherein said first and second command blocks are immediately adjacent to each other (Column 6, lines 62-67).

9.   With respect to claim 5, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3 above. In addition Goldberg discloses executing said first command block by said sever, and outputting the executing result to web-page request means (Column 2, lines 2-15); and outputting said second command block to said web-page request means without being executed by said server (Column 5, lines 5-8).

10.   With respect to claim 6, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 5 above. In addition Goldberg discloses wherein said web-page request means is a browser of a client's side (Column 5, lines 51-56).

11.   With respect to claim 7, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2 above. In addition Goldberg discloses wherein said client-side command is written in a Hyper Text Markup language (HTML) (Column 1, lines 36-37).

12.   With respect to claim 9, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2 above. In addition Goldberg discloses wherein said first and second index data include one or more items selected from a group consisting of a command- identifying code, starting address of said storage position, end address of said storage position and total length of said first portion of contents (Column 3, lines 43-51).

13.   With respect to claim 10, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition Goldberg discloses wherein said web-page data is converted from a web page written in a markup language compatible with a standard generalized markup language (SGML) and have a specified format of a common programmatic language (Column 2, lines 2-20).

14.   With respect to claim 11, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition neither Goldberg nor AAPA discloses wherein said server-side command is constructed by Server Side Includes (SSI), Command Gateway Interface (CGI), Active Server Pages (ASP) or Perl Hypertext Processor (PHP) technology. However, Lieberman discloses wherein said server-side command is constructed by Server Side Includes (SSI), Command Gateway Interface (CGI), Active Server Pages (ASP) or Perl Hypertext Processor (PHP) technology (Column 1, lines 40-51).

15.   With respect to claim 12, Goldberg discloses building an index file of a web page, wherein of a first command block including one or more continuous server-side commands and a second command block including one or more continuous client-side commands are recorded

(Column 3, lines 52-67); referring to said index file according in response to a web-page read

request (Column 3, lines 56-67); locating and outputting said first command block to a server

according to information of said first command block recorded in said index file (Column 4,

lines 57-64); and locating and outputting said second command block to said server according to

information of said second command block recorded in said index file (Column 4, lines 57-64).

Goldberg does not disclose an array or a linking list; filename of said web page and a file

allocation table associated with an operating system of said server.

However, AAPA discloses referring to said filename of said web page and a file allocation table

associated with an operating system of said server (Page 1; [0007], lines 9-14). The combination

of Goldberg and AAPA does not disclose an array or a linking list. However, Lieberman

discloses an array or a linking list (Column 5, lines 8-10).

16.   With respect to claim 13, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 12 above. In

addition Goldberg discloses executing said first command block by said sever, and outputting the

executing result to web-page request means (Column 5, lines 66-67; Column 6, lines 1-9); and

outputting said second command block to said web-page request means without being executed

by said server (Column 5, lines 5-8).

17.   With respect to claim 14, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 12 above. In

addition Goldberg discloses wherein said client-side command is written in a Hyper Text

Markup language (HTML) (Column 2, lines 5-20).

18.   With respect to claim 15, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 12 above. In addition Goldberg discloses wherein contents of said web page are stored in a database in a common programmatic language format (Column 7, lines 37-47).

19.   With respect to claim 16, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 15 above. In addition Goldberg discloses wherein said information of said first command block and said second command block include one or more items selected from a group consisting of a command-identifying code, starting address of said storage position, end address of said storage position and total length of said first portion of contents (Column 3, lines 43-51).

Response to Arguments

20.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 and 9-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

21.   With respect to applicants "**Priority**" concern at the top of page 6 of the instant arguments, regarding "potential interference in relation to the pending application". To address applicant's concern, there is no interference in relation to the pending application. The priority statement above simply requires the applicant to file a certified translated copy of their foreign application in order to properly receive foreign priority for the instant application.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to MARSHALL MCLEOD whose telephone number is (571)270-

3808. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 6:30 a.m-4:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Marshall McLeod
5/14/2008

/Ario Etienne/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157